REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the Request for Continued Examination submitted herewith and in view of the present amendment and the discussion that follows. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 and 9-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramey, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,298,128), and Claims 7 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al. ("Ramey"), in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0138296 (Holmes, Jr.). Claims 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey in view of Goldberg, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,223,156) and Claim 20 has been rejected as unpatentable over Ramey in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,813,349). Claims 1, 8, 9 and 13-20 have been amended. After a careful review of the claims and references, it is believed that the claims are in allowable form and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 9-18 have been rejected as being anticipated by Ramey, which concerns a system and method for message communications. The cited portion of Ramey (Col. 4, lines 59-64; Col. 5, lines 16-22 and 53-64) merely describes digitizing ("That message is received by the device 10 and digitized..." Col. 4, lines 59-60) and storing ("The processor then stores the digitized message in a portion 128 of the RAM126..." Col. 4, lines 61-62) of a message left by a caller (i.e., an answering machine function). Caller I.D., which is data not voice, is also stored along with time and date (Col. 4, lines 63-64). The cited Col. 5, lines 16-22 merely describes storage of telephone numbers and name information and Col. 5, lines 50-51 merely describes change to the caller ID attribute, neither of which is a description of packetizing voice contact information. There is no disclosure whatever in these passages of packetizing the digitized voice

data. Thus, while digitizing of voice is described, packetizing is not. Therefore Ramey does not teach the claimed packetizing feature. Thus, independent claims 1, 9, and 13 are distinguishable over Ramey. Ramey also does not disclose the use of speech recognition to convert the voice contact information as claimed in independent claim 1, 9 and 13. Further, Ramey concerns message communication and does not describe a method suitable for an automatic call distribution system, with accumulation of stored information to be searched, usable in post-processing reporting, etc., or for key word searches. (See Application, p. 14, Para. 50).

All independent claims 1, 9, and 13 call for searching the stored voice contact information which is in digitized, packetized form. Ramey does not teach searching the converted voice data, but rather searches information in a correspondent database such as Fig. 2 which stores caller I.D. information and other attributes related to the telephone (see. Col. 5, lines 31-35) but not digitized, packetized voice data. Thus, Ramey does not teach searching the digitized, packetized voice data as claimed but searches a database of non-voice and unconverted telephone system generated data such as caller ID data. Accordingly, Claims 1, 9 and 13, are believed to be distinguishable over Ramey for this reason as well. Further, none of the other cited references teach these claimed features; and therefore, Claims 1, 9 and 13 are believed to be neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by any combination of the cited references. In addition claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14-20 are dependent upon now allowable Claims 1, 9 and 13, and therefore are also believed to be in allowable form.

With regard to claims 2, 10, and 14, the Examiner asserts that Ramey teaches the voice message is inherently packetized. However, this is an unsupported assertion. The cited Col. 4, lines 59-64 merely describes digitizing which does not inherently require or suggest packetizing and Fig. 2 shows merely the correspondent database. Thus, there is no disclosure of packetizing

either the voice message or voice contact data in Ramey, and claims 2, 10, 14 are therefore further distinguishable on that basis. Regarding claim 3, 11 and 15, the Examiner asserts that Ramey teaches converting the message to text because it discloses digitizing at Col. 4, lines 59-60. However, digitizing does not constitute conversion to text. For this reason, Claims 3, 11 and 15 are further distinguishable over Ramey as well.

Claim 8 has been rejected as obvious over Ramey in view of Goldberg, which describes a speech recognition system for recognizing caller identifiers from a speech signal using location to enhance accuracy. The system digitizes the speech signals in an A/D converter 50, and processor 40 generates multiple caller identifier choices (Col. 2, lines 53-58). This system attempts to recognize an assigned caller identifier spoken by the caller in response to a request for the caller identifier (Col. 3, lines 9-15). The Goldberg system does not store messages converted to text, for use in post-processing research and evaluation, but merely generates selected individual caller identifier candidates and then use them to determine what caller identifier was spoken by the caller. Thus, Claim 8 is further distinguishable over the combination of Ramey and Goldberg.

As discussed above, claims 1-20 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by any combination of the cited references. Therefore, allowance of claims 1-20 is believed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
James A. Scheer, Esq.
Registration No. 29,434

Dated: August 3, 2006
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 655-1500
Facsimile: (312) 655-1501